Docket No.: END920010097US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Patent Application of: Glenn C. Godoy et al

Group Art Unit: 2161	:	IBM Corporation
Examiner: Cam Linh T. Nguyen	:	Intellectual Property Law
Serial No.: 10/042,403	:	Department IQ0A/040-3
Filed: 01/09/2002	:	1701 North Street
Title: COMMON BUSINESS DATA MANAGEMENT	:	Endicott, New York 13760

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 10/24/05.

Georgia Y. Brundege 10/24/05
Georgia Y. Brundege Date

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to a Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated 08/26/05, Appellants provide herewith a revised Appeal Brief which includes the concise explanation, 4, and concise statement, 5.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/21/05 By: John Pivnichny
John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119

Docket No.: END920010097US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Patent Application of: Glenn C. Godoy et al

Group Art Unit: 2161	:	IBM Corporation
Examiner: Cam Linh T. Nguyen	:	Intellectual Property Law
Serial No.: 10/042,403	:	Department IQ0A/040-3
Filed: 01/09/2002	:	1701 North Street
Title: COMMON BUSINESS DATA MANAGEMENT	:	Endicott, New York 13760

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 10/24/05.

Georgia Y. Brundege 10/24/05
Georgia Y. Brundege Date

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REVISED APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Appellants hereby appeal from the Final Action of 01/03/2005 and the Advisory Action of 03/28/2005, and offer the following arguments in support thereof.

(i) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party of interest is International Business Machines Corporation, a corporation of New York, with a place of business at Armonk, NY 10504.

(ii) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences with which the undersigned is aware.

(iii) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 - 19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 - 19 have all been finally rejected and are the subject matter of this appeal.

(iv) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment after the Final Action of 01/03/2005 was filed 03/02/2005. The Examiner's Advisory Action of 03/28/2005 maintains the final rejection, however, for purposes of appeal, the amendment will be entered.

(v) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellants' invention relates to a unique method, system, and program product for maintaining common business data for a plurality of computer applications. Each application requires business control date to be set up and maintained in order to run the application. In many cases, the business control data required for one application is the same data required by another application. However, because the computer applications are separate and usually independently developed and independently installed, differing solutions are created as part of each application to perform the same data set up and maintenance tasks on much of the same data. Consequently, maintaining and updating control data as it changes is a very complicated and time consuming task requiring each application be checked and updated as necessary.

Appellants' claimed subject matter provides a novel solution

to this situation through use of a common database. A model of business rules which extend across i.e. (that is) span, a plurality of applications. These rules are built into the common database. Business control data is entered into this common database. The appropriate portions of the business control data is then disseminated to the plurality of applications according to the business rules.

Specifically, independent claim 1 requires developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications as defined in Appellants' Specification page 6, lines 7 - 10, page 7, lines 16 - 20, and FIG. 1, element 110, spanning application 102, 104, 106, and 108. The rules are required to be built into a common database as defined in page 6, lines 8 - 10, page 7, lines 12 - 20, and FIG. 1, element 110. In claim 1, business control data is also entered into the common database as defined on page 7, line 19 - page 9, line 10. Claim 1 further requires disseminating to the plurality of applications, respective portions of the business control data according to the business rules as defined on page 10, lines 1 - 11, page 11, lines 19 - 21, and FIG. 3, element 304, being propagated to applications 304, 306, 308, and 310.

Independent claim 10 requires a system having elements corresponding to the steps of claim 1 as defined in the respective specification and drawings noted above. Furthermore, structure for disseminating the business control data is further defined on page 12, lines 1 - 4.

Appellants' independent claim 19 requires program instruction means for performing the same steps as those of claim 1 as defined in the respective specification and drawings noted

above. Further definition is provided on page 8, line 14, to page 10, line 11, and element 116 of FIG. 1.

(vi) GROUNDS OF REJECTION

There are two grounds of rejection. Claims 1, 6 - 10, and 15 - 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iyengar et al. (US Patent 6,018,627).

Specifically, for independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the Examiner cites Iyengar FIGs. 1 and 7, and column 3, lines 64 - 65, column 4, lines 27 - 33, as describing developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building the rules into a common database. The Examiner cites Iyengar, FIGs. 7 - 9 and column 9, lines 23 - 48 as describing entering business control data into the common database. The Examiner cites Iyengar column 3, lines 1 - 2, and column 12, lines 35 - 51, as describing disseminating to the plurality of applications, respective portions of the business control data according to the business rules.

Additional parts of Iyengar are cited as describing the requirement of dependent claims 6 - 7, 8 - 9, and 15 - 18.

All of the remaining claims, claims 2 - 5 and 11 - 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iyengar in view of Souder et al. (US Patent 5,724,556).

Regarding this second ground of rejection, for dependent claims 2 - 5 and 11 - 14, the Examiner cites various portions of Souder in combination with Iyengar as describing all of the requirements of these dependent claims. Further detail is not needed because Appellants argue below that all of the independent

claims from which these dependent claims depend, are allowable, and therefore all of the dependent claims rejected under this second grounds of rejection, as well as the first grounds of rejection, above, are also allowable.

(vii) ARGUMENT

Claims 1, 6 - 10, and 15 - 19 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the prior art and, particularly, US Patent 6,018,627 (Iyengar).

Iyengar does not disclose the present invention since, among other things, Iyengar does not disclose developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications as clearly recited in Appellants' independent claims 1 and 19, or a business model having a plurality of applications as recited in independent claim 10. Iyengar describes entities and objects stored in his repository 20, (column 4, lines 28 - 31). However, Iyengar clearly recites a single application, the application under development (column 4, line 29). Furthermore, in column 4, lines 31 - 33, Iyengar gives an example which clearly describes an application (column 4, line 33), i.e., a single application.

Appellants' independent claims 1, 10, and 19 require rules spanning or having a plurality of applications.

Iyengar also describes in column 3, lines 60 - 63, legacy items which may include pre-existing applications. The discovered legacy items may then be transformed into business or object models, or into reusable components. Here, Iyengar uses the plural word "applications." However, there is no description or suggestion that the business or object models resulting from transforming the legacy items are common between individual

applications, i.e., span a plurality of applications as required by Appellants' independent claims 1 and 19.

The Examiner's explanation in the Advisory Action of 03/28/2005 states that this claim language of "spanning a plurality of applications" does not suggest that the model of business rules must be common between applications. Appellants respectfully disagree. A common dictionary definition of the word "span" is "to extend across: *a career that spanned 40 years*" See the American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1985, p. 1170, third definition. Referring, for example, to Appellants' claim 1, clearly the model of business rules that is developed must span, i.e., extend across, a plurality of applications. Iyengar merely states that the legacy items for each application may be transformed into business or object models. There is no description that these are common between or extend across a plurality of applications. Iyengar therefore fails to anticipate Appellants' invention of independent claims 1, 10, and 19. These claims are allowable.

All of Appellants' other pending claims depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims and therefore also require these features.

Appellants' position therefore is that rejection of the pending claims is in error and must be withdrawn. All of the claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Iyengar.

Under the second grounds of rejection, claims 2 - 5 and 11 - 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Iyengar in view of Souder. However, this rejection is moot in view of the arguments above. This rejection must also be

withdrawn.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse the Examiner's final rejection of all of the claims on appeal, and allow these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/21/05

By: John Pivnichny

John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119

(viii) CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method of updating business control data, comprising the steps of:

developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building said rules into a common database;

entering business control data into said common database; and

disseminating to said plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said business rules.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said rules are built to define a dissemination structure.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein said structure has a plurality of instances of said common database.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein said plurality of instances run on a corresponding plurality of servers located in corresponding geographical locations.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein said geographical locations are in disparate continents.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein said business control data is entered into said common database using a common data administration application.

7. The method of claim 6, wherein said common data administration application is adapted to receive input from logged on individuals and from an automated feed from a source system.

8. The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of entering additional rules into said common data administration application.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein said business control data is entered into said common database according to said additional rules.

10. A system for updating business control data, comprising:

a relational database having rules defining a business model having a plurality of applications;

business control data in said relational database; and

dissemination means coupled to said relational database for disseminating said business control data to said plurality of applications according to said business rules.

11. The system of claim 10, wherein said rules define a dissemination structure.

12. The system of claim 11, wherein said structure has a plurality of instances of said relational database.

13. The system of claim 12, wherein said plurality of instances run on a corresponding plurality of servers located in corresponding geographical locations.

14. The system of claim 13, wherein said geographical locations are in disparate continents.

15. The system of claim 10, further comprising a common data administration application coupled to said relational database for entering said business control data into said relational database.

16. The system of claim 15, wherein said common data administration application is adapted to receive input from logged on individuals and from an automated feed from a source system.

17. The system of claim 15, further comprising additional rules in said common data administration application.

18. The system of claim 17, wherein said common data administration application is adapted to enter said business control data into said relational database according to said additional rules.

19. A computer program product for instructing a processor to maintain business control data, said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable medium;

first program instruction means for developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building said rules into a common database;

second program instruction means for entering business control data into said common database; and

third program instruction means for disseminating to said plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said business rules; and wherein

all three of said program instruction means are recorded on said medium.